

JOHNS HOPKINS
UNIVERSITY CIRCULARS

Published with the approbation of the Board of Trustees

VOL. XXI.—No. 156.]

BALTIMORE, MARCH, 1902.

[PRICE, 10 CENTS.]

CELEBRATION OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING
OF THE UNIVERSITY AND INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT REMSEN

February 21 and 22, 1902.

COMMEMORATIVE ADDRESS BY DANIEL C. GILMAN,

President of the Johns Hopkins University from 1875 to 1901.

FEBRUARY 21, 1902.

This is not the time, although it is a birthday, to review the infancy of this University. Reminiscences of the cradle and the nursery are profoundly interesting to a very small number of the near and dear, but according to a formula, which may be stated with mathematical precision, the interest varies inversely as the square of the distance.

It is meet and right and our bounden duty to commemorate the munificence of the founder, who in his grove at Clifton, and at his residence in town, spent the close of his life in perfecting a plan by which his fortune might be made to benefit humanity. Two noble purposes, the education of youth and the relief of suffering,—the Johns Hopkins University and the Johns Hopkins Hospital,—became the objects of his thought and bounty. It would be pleasant to dwell upon the personalities of his early advisers,—three of whom may now witness our fervent congratulations. We might journey with them to Cambridge, New Haven, Ithaca, Ann Arbor, and Charlottesville, as they engaged in enquiries respecting the nature and offices of those leading universities, an example of original research, praiseworthy and beneficial. We might sit with them in a little room on North Charles Street, and listen to Presidents Eliot, Angell, and White as they were subjected to 'interviews,' recorded by the swift strokes of the stenographic pen, and now preserved in our archives. We might wonder by what process the Trustees selected a president, and be willing to learn what he said to them in his earliest conversation. It would gratify some

curiosity to review the correspondence carried on with those who afterward became members of the faculty,—and with those who did not. It would be an extraordinary pleasure to the speaker on this occasion, to awaken the memories of those early days of unbounded enthusiasm and unfettered ideality, well described in a periodical by one who was here at the outset,—days which surprised and delighted intelligent observers.

These temptations must be avoided. The occasion is too important, the audience too varied, the visitors too many and too distinguished, to warrant the employment of this brief hour in personal reminiscences and local congratulations. We are rather bound to consider some of the grave problems of education which have engaged, during a quarter of a century, the study of able and learned men, and have led to the development, in this country, of the idea of the University. This period has seen marvellous improvements in higher education, and although, in the history of intellectual development, the nineteenth century may not be as significant as the thirteenth, when modern universities came into being at Bologna, Paris, and Oxford, yet we have lived at a time when forces have been set to work of the highest significance. Libraries, seminaries and laboratories have been enlarged and established in every part of the land.

Let us go back to the year 1876, that year of jubilee, when the centennial celebration in Philadelphia brought together, in open concord, states and peoples separated by dissension and war. Representatives from every part of the land assembled,

in the City of Brotherly Love, to commemorate the growth of a century. The triumph of liberal and industrial arts, the progress of architecture, sculpture, and painting, were interpreted by the music of our Sidney Lanier. The year was certainly propitious. So was the place. Maryland was a central state, and Baltimore a midway station between the North and the South. The people had been divided by the war, but there were no battle fields in our neighborhood to keep in mind the strife of brethren. The State of Maryland had been devoted to the idea of higher education ever since an enthusiast in the earliest colonial days projected the establishment of a university on an island in the Susquehanna. Liberal charters had been granted to colleges, of which St. John's, the successor of the first free school, must have honorable mention, a college likely to be increasingly useful during the twentieth century. The University of Maryland, with scanty resources, encouraged professional training in law, medicine, and the liberal arts, (nominally also, in theology,) but its efforts were restricted by the lack of funds. Nathan R. Smith, David Hoffman and other men of eminence were in the faculty. The Catholic Church had established within the borders of the state a large number of important schools of learning. One of them, St. Mary's College, under the cultivated fathers of St. Sulpice, had been the training place of some of the original promoters of the Johns Hopkins University. Yet there was nothing within the region between Philadelphia and Charlottesville, between the Chesapeake and the Ohio, which embodied, in 1876, the idea of a true university. Thus it appears that the time, the place and the circumstances, were favorable to an endowment which seemed to be extraordinarily large, for the munificence of Rockefeller, Stanford and Carnegie could not be foreseen.

The founder made no effort to unfold a plan. He simply used one word,—UNIVERSITY,—and he left it to his successors to declare its meaning in the light of the past, in the hope of the future. There is no indication that he was interested in one branch of knowledge more than in another. He had no educational 'fad.' There is no evidence that he had read the writings of Cardinal Newman or of Mark Pattison, and none that the great parliamentary reports had come under his eye. He was a large-minded man, who knew that the success of the foundation would depend upon the wisdom of those to whom its development was entrusted; and the Trustees were large minded men who knew that their efforts must be guided by the learning, the experience, and the devotion of the Faculty. There was a natural desire, in this locality, that the principal positions should be filled by men with whom the community was acquainted, but the Trustees were not governed by an aspiration so provincial. They sought the best men that could be found, without regard to the places where they were born, or the colleges where they had been educated. So, on Washington's birthday, in 1876, after words of benediction from the President of Harvard University, our early counsellor and our constant friend, the plans of this University were publicly announced in the President's inaugural speech.

As I cast my thoughts backward, memories of the good and great who have been members of our society rise vividly before us,—benefactors who have aided us by generous gifts, in emergencies and in prosperity; faithful guardians of the trust; illustrious teachers; and brilliant scholars who have proceeded to posts of usefulness and honor, now and then in Japan, in India, in Canada, but most of them in our own land, from Harvard to the Golden Gate.

I must not linger, but lead you on to broader themes. May I venture to assume that we are an assembly of idealists. As such I speak; as such you listen. We are also practical men. As such, we apply ourselves to useful purposes, and to our actions we apply the test of common sense. Are our aims high enough? are they too high? are our methods justified by experience? are they approved by the judgment of our peers? can we see any results from the labors of five and twenty years? can we justify a vigorous appeal for enlargement? These and kindred questions press themselves for consideration on this memorial day. But in trying to answer them, let us never lose sight of the ideal,—let us care infinitely more for the future than we do for the past. Let us compare our work with what is done elsewhere and with what might be done in Baltimore. In place of pride and satisfaction, or of regret that our plans have been impeded, let us rejoice that the prospects are so encouraging, that the opportunities of yesterday will be surpassed tomorrow.

If it be true that "the uses of Adversity" are sweet,—Adversity that "wears yet a precious jewel in his head,"—let us look forward to leaving our restricted site for a permanent home where our academic life will be "exempt from public haunt," where we shall "find tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, sermons in stones, and good in every thing." In faith and hope and gratitude, I have a vision of Homewood, where one person and another will build the structures of which we stand in so much need,—where scholarship will have its quiet retreat, where experimental science will be removed from the jar of the city street, where health and vigor will be promoted by athletic sports in the groves of Academus. The promised land which Moses sees from Pisgah, our Joshua will possess.

At the close of our civil war came the opportunity of Baltimore. It led to an extraordinary and undesigned fulfillment of an aspiration of George Washington. As his exact language is not often quoted, I venture to give it here. In his last will and testament, after expressing his ardent desire that local attachments and State prejudices should disappear, he uses the following words.

"Looking anxiously forward to the accomplishment of so desirable an object as this is (in my estimation), my mind has not been able to contemplate any plan more likely to effect the measure, than the establishment of a University in a central part of the United States, to which the youths of fortune and talents from all parts thereof may be sent for the completion of their education, in all the branches of polite literature, in arts and sciences, in acquiring knowledge in the principles of politics and good government, and, as a matter of infinite importance in my judgment, by associating with each other, and forming friendships in juvenile years,

be enabled to free themselves in a proper degree from those local prejudices and habitual jealousies which have just been mentioned, and which, when carried to excess, are never-failing sources of disquietude to the public mind, and pregnant of mischievous consequences to this country."

You will please to notice that he did not speak of a university in Washington, but of a university "in the central part of the United States." What is now the central part of the United States? Is it Chicago or is it Baltimore?

Let me now proceed to indicate the conditions which existed in this country when our work was projected. You will see that extraordinary advances have been made. The munificent endowments of Mr. John D. Rockefeller and of Mr. and Mrs. Leland Stanford, the splendid generosity of the State legislatures in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, and other Western States, the enlarged resources of Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Pennsylvania and other well established universities, and now the unique and unsurpassed generosity of Mr. Carnegie, have entirely changed the aspects of liberal education and of scientific investigation.

As religion, the relation of finite man to the Infinite, is the most important of all human concerns, I begin by a brief reference to the attitude of universities toward Faith and Knowledge. The earliest universities of Europe were either founded by the Church or by the State. Whatever their origin, they were under the control, to a large extent, of ecclesiastical authorities. These traditions came to our country, and the original colleges were founded by learned and Godly men, most of them, if not all, the ministers of the gospel. Later, came the State universities and later still, the private foundations like that in which we are concerned. Gradually, among the Protestants, laymen have come to hold the chief positions of authority formerly held by the clergy. The official control, however, is less interesting at this moment than the attitude of universities toward the advancement of knowledge. Today, happily, apprehensions are not felt, to any great extent, respecting the advancement of science. It is more and more clearly seen that the interpretation of the laws by which the universe is governed extending from the invisible rays of the celestial world to the most minute manifestations of organic life reveal one plan, one purpose, one supreme sovereignty—far transcending the highest conceptions to which the human mind can attain respecting this sovereign and infinite Power. Sectarian supremacy and theological differences have dwindled therefore to insignificance, in institutions where the supreme desire is to understand the world in which we are placed, and to develop the ablest intellects of each generation, subservient to the primeval injunction "replenish the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Notwithstanding these words, the new Biology, that is the study of living creatures, encountered peculiar prejudices and opposition. It was the old story over again. Geology, early in the century, had been violently attacked; astronomy, in previous centuries, met its bitter opponents; higher criticism is now dreaded. Yet quickly

and patiently the investigator has prosecuted and will continue his search for the truth,—heedless of consequences, assured by the Master's words,—"the Truth shall make you free."

Still the work goes on. Science is recognized as the hand-maid of religion. Evolution is regarded by many theologians as confirming the strictest doctrines of predestination. The propositions which were so objectionable thirty years ago are now received with as little alarm as the propositions of Euclid. There are mathematicians who do not regard the Euclidean geometry as the best mode of presenting certain mathematical truths, and there are also naturalists who will not accept the doctrines of Darwin, without limitation or modification, but nobody thinks of fighting over the utterances of either of these philosophers. In fact, I think it one of the most encouraging signs of our times that devout men, devoted to scientific study, see no conflict between their religious faith and their scientific knowledge. Is it not true that as the realm of Knowledge extends the region of Faith though restricted remains? Is it not true that Science today is as far from demonstrating certain great propositions, which in the depths of our souls we all believe, as it was in the days of the Greek philosophers? This university, at the outset, assumed the position of a fearless and determined investigator of nature. It carried on its work with quiet, reverent, and unobtrusive recognition of the immanence of divine power,—of the Majesty, Dominion, and Might, known to men by many names, revered by us in the words that we learned from our mothers' lips, Almighty God, the Father everlasting.

Another danger, thirty years ago, was that of conflict between the advocates of classical and scientific study. For many centuries Greek and Latin were supreme in the faculty of liberal arts, enforced and strengthened by metaphysics and mathematics. During the last half century, physical and natural sciences have claimed an equal rank. The promotion has not been yielded without a struggle, but it is pleasant to remember that in this place, no conflict has arisen. Among us, one degree, that of Bachelor of Arts, is given alike to the students of the Humanities and the students of Nature and the degree of Doctor of Philosophy may be won by advanced work in the most remote languages of the past or in the most recent developments of biology and physics. Two illustrious teachers were the oldest members of the original faculty;—one of them universally recognized as among the foremost geometricians of the world,—the other, renowned for his acquaintance with the masters of thought in many tongues, and especially for his appreciation of the writers of ancient Greece, upon whose example all modern literature is based.

Our fathers spoke of "Church and State," and we but repeat their ideas when we say that universities are the promoters of pure religion and wise government. This university has not been identified with political partisanship,—though, its members, like all patriots, have held and expressed their opinions upon current questions, local and national. Never have the political views of any teacher helped or hindered his

preferment; nor have I any idea what would be the result of the party classification of our staff. This, however, may be claimed. The study of politics, in the sense of Freeman, "History is past politics, and politics present history," has been diligently promoted. The principles of Roman law, international arbitration, jurisprudence, economics, and institutional history have here been set forth and inculcated,—so that in every part of the land, we can point to our graduates as the wise interpreters of political history, the strong promoters of democratic institutions, the firm believers in the merit system of appointments, and in local self-government.

A phrase which has lately been in vogue is original research. Like all other new terms, it is often misapplied, often misunderstood. It may be the highest occupation of the human mind. It may be the most insignificant. A few words may therefore be requisite to explain our acceptance of this word. When this university began, it was a common complaint, still uttered in many places, that the ablest teachers were absorbed in routine and were forced to spend their strength in the discipline of tyros, so that they had no time for carrying forward their studies or for adding to human knowledge. Here the position was taken at the outset that the chief professors should have ample time to carry on the higher work for which they had shown themselves qualified, and also that younger men, as they gave evidence of uncommon qualities, should likewise be encouraged to devote themselves to study. Even those who were candidates for degrees were taught what was meant by profitable investigation. They were shown how to discover the limits of the known; how to extend, even by minute accretions, the realm of knowledge; how to coöperate with other men in the prosecution of enquiry; and how to record in exact language, and on the printed page, the results attained. Investigation has thus been among us the duty of every leading professor, and he has been the guide and inspirer of fellows and pupils, whose work may not bear his name, but whose results are truly products of the inspiration and guidance which he has freely bestowed.

The complaint was often heard, in the early seventies, that no provision was made in this country for post-graduate work except in the three professional schools. Accordingly, a system of fellowships, of scholarships, and of other provisions for advanced study was established here, so well adapted to the wants of the country at that time that its provisions have been widely copied in other places. It now seems as if there was danger of rivalry in the solicitation of students, which is certainly unworthy, and there is danger also that too many men will receive stipendiary encouragement to prepare themselves for positions they can never attain. In the early days of the French Academy when a seat in that body was a very great prize, a certain young man was told to wait until he was older, and the remark was added that in order to secure good speed from horses, a basket of oats should always be tied to the front of the carriage pole as a constant incitement. It would indeed be a misfortune if a system of fellowships should be open to this objection. Nevertheless, whoever scans our register of Fellows will discover that many of the ablest men in the

country, of the younger generation, have here received encouragement and aid.

When this university began the opportunities for scientific publication in this country were very meagre. The American Journal of Science was the chief repository for short and current papers. The memoirs of a few learned societies came out at slow intervals and could not be freely opened to investigators. This university in the face of obvious objection determined to establish certain journals which might be the means of communication between the scholars of this country and those abroad. Three journals were soon commenced: The American Journal of Mathematics; the American Journal of Philology; the American Chemical Journal. Remember that these were "American" journals, in fact as well as in name, open to all the scholars of the country. Other periodicals came afterwards, devoted to History and Politics, to Biology, to Modern Languages, to Experimental Medicine and to Anatomy. Moderate appropriations were made to foreign journals, of great importance, which lacked support, the English Journal of Physiology and the German Journal of Assyriology. Nor were the appropriations of the Trustees restricted to periodical literature. Generous encouragement was given to the publication of important treatises, like the researches of Dr. Brooks upon *Salpa*; to the physiological papers of Dr. Martin; to the studies in logic of Mr. Peirce and his followers; to Professor Rowland's magnificent photographs of the solar spectrum; to the printing of a facsimile of the earliest Christian document after the times of the Apostles; and recently, with the coöperation of the University of Tübingen, to the exact reproduction by Dr. Bloomfield of a unique manuscript which has an important bearing upon comparative philology.

I am not without apprehensions that our example to the country has been infelicitous, not less than thirty institutions being known to me, which are now engaged in the work of publication. The consequence is that it is almost impossible for scholars to find out and make use of many important memoirs, which are thus hidden away. One of the problems for the next generation to solve is the proper mode of encouraging the publication of scientific treatises.

I cannot enumerate the works of scholarship which have been published without the aid of the university by those connected with it,—studies in Greek syntax, in mathematics, in history, in chemistry, in medicine and surgery, in economics, in pathology and in many other branches. The administration now closing can have no monument more enduring than the great mass of contributions to knowledge, which are gathered, (like the cairn of boulders and pebbles which commemorates in Cracow, the burial place of Kosciusko), a bibliothecal cairn, in the office of the Trustees, to remind every officer and every visitor of our productivity in science and letters.

There are many who believe that the noblest work in which we have engaged is the advancement of medical education and science. Several agencies have been favorable. The munificence of the founder established a hospital, which was

recognized as soon as it was opened, as the foremost of its kind in Christendom. He directed that when completed it should be a part of the University and, accordingly, when the time came for organizing a medical and surgical staff, the principal professors were simultaneously appointed to the chairs of one institution, to the clinics of the other. They were to be constantly exercised in the relief of suffering and in the education of youth. For the lack of the requisite funds, the University at first provided only for instruction in those scientific branches which underlie the science of medicine. At length, the organization of the school of medicine was made possible by a very large gift of money, received from a lady of Baltimore, who was familiar with the requirements of medical science, and eager to see that they were met. By her munificence the University was enabled to organize and maintain that great department, which now reflects so much honor upon this city and which does so much by example, by publication, by systematic instruction, and by investigation to carry forward those varied sciences, anatomy, physiology, physiological chemistry, pharmacy, pathology, and the various branches of medicine and surgery. In accordance with the plans of the University, the generous donor made it a condition of her gift that candidates for the degree of Doctor of Medicine should be those only who had taken a baccalaureate degree based upon a prolonged study of science and the modern languages. A four years' course of study was also prescribed and women were admitted to the classes upon the same terms as men. The liberal and antecedent aid of women throughout the country in the promotion of these plans is commemorated by a building inscribed "the women's fund memorial building." The excellent laboratory facilities, the clinical opportunities, the organization of a training school for nurses, and especially the ability of the physicians and surgeons have excited abundant emulation and imitation in other parts of the country,—a wonderful gain to humanity. It is more and more apparent among us that a medical school should be a part of a university and closely affiliated with a hospital. It is also obvious that the right kind of preliminary training should be antecedent to medical studies.

I must ask the indulgence of our friends from a distance as I now dwell, for a moment, on the efforts which have been made to identify the Johns Hopkins University with the welfare of the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland. Such a hospital and such medical advisers as I have referred to are not the only benefits of our foundation. The journals, which carry the name of Baltimore to every learned society in the world are a minor but serviceable advantage. The promotion of sanitary reform is noteworthy, the study of taxation and in general of municipal conditions, the purification of the local supply of water, the advancement of public education by courses of instruction offered to teachers, diligent attention to the duties of charity and philanthropy, these are among the services which the faculty have rendered to the city of their homes. Their efforts are not restricted to the city. A prolonged scientific study of the oyster, its life history, and the influences which help or hinder its produc-

tion, is a valuable contribution. The establishment of a meteorological service throughout the State in connection with the Weather Bureau of the United States is also important. Not less so is the Geological Survey of Maryland, organized with the coöperation of the United States Geological Survey, to promote a knowledge of the physical resources of the State, exact maps, the improvement of highways, and the study of water supplies, of conditions favorable to agriculture, and of deposits of mineral wealth, within this region. To the efficiency of these agencies it is no doubt due that the State of Maryland has twice contributed to the general fund of the university.

Nor have our studies been merely local. The biological laboratory, the first establishment of its kind in this country, has carried forward for many years the study of marine life at various points on the Atlantic and has published many important memoirs, while it has trained many able investigators now at work in every part of the land. Experimental psychology was here introduced. Bacteriology early found a home among us. The contributions to chemistry have been numerous and important. Here was the cradle of Saccharine, that wisely diffused and invaluable concentration of sweetness, whose manufacturers unfortunately do not acknowledge the source to which it is due. In the physical laboratory, light has been thrown upon three fundamental subjects:—the mechanical equivalent of heat, the exact value of the standard ohm, and the elucidation of the nature of the solar spectrum. For many years this place was the chief seat in this country for pure and advanced mathematics. The study of languages and literature, oriental, classical, and modern, has been assiduously promoted. Where has the Bible received more attention than is given to it in our Semitic department? where the study of ancient civilization in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Palestine? where did the Romance languages, in their philological aspect first receive attention? To American and institutional history, persistent study has been given. Of noteworthy significance also are the theses required of those who are admitted to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, which must be printed before the candidate is entitled to all the honors of the degree.

I might enlarge this category, but I will refrain. The time allotted to me is gone. Yet I cannot sit down without bringing to your minds the memories of those who have been with us and have gone out from us to be seen no more: Sylvester, that profound thinker devoted to abstractions, the illustrious geometer whose seven prolific years were spent among us and who gave an impulse to mathematical researches in every part of this country; Morris, the Oxford graduate, the well trained classicist, devout, learned, enthusiastic, and helpful, most of all in the education of the young; accomplished Martin, who brought to this country new methods of physiological enquiry, led the way in the elucidation of many problems of profound importance, and trained up those who have carried his methods to every part of the land; Adams, suggestive, industrious, inspiring, versatile, beneficent, who promoted, as none had done before, systematic studies of the

civil, ecclesiastical, and educational resources of this country ; and Rowland, cut down like Adams in his prime, honored in every land, peer of the greatest physicists of our day, never to be forgotten in the history of physical science. I remind you also of the early student of mathematics, Thomas Craig, and of George Huntington Williams, the geologist, whose memory is cherished with admiration and love. Nor do I forget those who have here been trained to become leaders in their various departments throughout the country. One must be named, who has gone from their number, Keeler, the gifted astronomer, who died as the chief of the Lick Observatory in California, whose contributions to astronomical science place him among the foremost investigators of our day ; and another, the martyr Lazear, who, in order that the pestilence of yellow fever might be subdued, gave up his life for humanity.

Like clouds that rake the mountain summit,
Or waves that own no curbing hand,
How fast has brother followed brother
From sunshine to the sunless land.

It is sad to recall these interrupted careers. It is delightful to remember the elevated character of those I have named, and delightful to think of hundreds who have been with us, carriers to distant parts of our country and to other lands of the seeds which they gathered in our gardens of science. It is delightful to live in this age of bounty ; it is delightful to know that the citizens of Baltimore who in former years have supplemented the gifts of the founder by more than a million of dollars have come forward to support a new administration with the gift of a site of unsurpassed beauty and fitness. A new day dawns. 'It is always sunrise somewhere in the world.'

[The speaker then turned to the Faculty, who were seated upon his left. They rose, and he addressed them as follows :—]

Dear Brothers :

We have been comrades on the field, seamen on the deep, toilers in the mines, but we have been delving, sailing, striving not for fame or pelf, but for that which is more precious than rubies. Each one has shared in the acquisitions of others, has rejoiced in their honors. Consider our pursuits. Some have discovered in cuneiform tablets and in Egyptian hieroglyphics clues to the origin of religion and government. The Bible has been studied in its original texts and in modern versions, with the reverence that is its due. The teachings of Plato and Aristotle, the poetry of Pindar and Sophocles, the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides have been presented to us as living authors. We have listened to the eloquence of Cicero, reviewed the Annals of Tacitus. Dante is no stranger here. Chaucer and Shakespeare are our friends. The writers of modern Europe are likewise known and honored. Ancient and modern history has had strong votaries.

So too in science. The regions of abstract thought have been penetrated by mathematicians and logicians. The arcana

of nature have been opened to the researches of chemistry, physics and biology.

In such companionship, it has been delightful to live and study and teach and work in Baltimore, to watch the unfolding of talents and the preparation of bright youth for the activities of life. In the face of difficulties our standard has never been lowered. In joyous exhilaration we have breathed the oxygen of high altitudes.

Now I look forward five and twenty years. In a spacious lawn, surrounded by noble trees and beautiful shrubbery, stands a majestic building devoted to the library, the very heart of academic life.

Near by, two halls are consecrated to museums of natural history and the fine arts. There are working rooms for all branches of science. The spire of a chapel points heavenward. Here is a fountain, there a statue. An open field is well trodden by athletic exercises. The colonial dwelling, once the home of an illustrious patriot, is now the president's house. On the borders of the ground are residences of the faculty and students. An air of repose, of reflection, and of study pervades the place. It is the home of bright and earnest youth fitting themselves for the various pursuits of life. Beneath the Wyman oak, sits an antiquary, reading in a musty pamphlet the record of the nineteenth century, and I hear him say : "Those men were the modern knights of King Arthur, pledged to a noble quest, the quest for truth, and bound to their university by ties of loyalty, affection, and lofty aspiration."

REUNION OF THE HISTORICAL SEMINARY.

On Thursday evening, February 20, 1902, a reunion of the Historical Seminary took place in the Historical Library in McCoy Hall. This was a gathering of former students in history, politics and economics and was held in connection with a regular meeting of the Historical and Political Science Association.

This Association was founded December 19, 1877. The first president of it was Dr. D. C. Gilman and the first secretary, Professor Henry C. Adams, now of the University of Michigan. This meeting was the 536th in its history and was called to order by Dr. J. M. Vincent in the Bluntschli Room, the members being seated about the long table which has been the center of the Seminary work for more than twenty years.

A paper on "The Human Side of the Continental Congress" was then presented by Dr. Herbert Friedenwald, A. B. (J. H. U.), 1890. Several of the visiting members gave their reminiscences of Seminary life. Among these were Professors Jameson and D. R. Dewey and Doctors Wilhelm and Hartwell. Sixty-six persons were present, all of whom had been in some way connected with the department. Of one hundred and three surviving Doctors of Philosophy, who graduated in history, politics and economics, thirty-two attended the meeting.

THE INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT REMSEN

February 22, 1902.

THE INAUGURATION CEREMONY.

President Gilman came forward, and after a brief address, led his successor in office to the Presidential chair. This official chair, the gift of Harvard Alumni, is an exact copy of an antique chair which many of the predecessors of President Eliot have occupied. The remarks of Dr. Gilman were these :—

The distinguished scholar who has been called to the Presidency of this University, by the unanimous voice of the Trustees and with the hearty concurrence of the Faculty, is no stranger to the duties and cares that devolve upon him. He has been a member of our society since its earliest days,—and has won the increasing affection of the students, the increasing respect of the authorities, the increasing admiration of the community. With the knowledge of a colleague, and the devotion of a friend, I now welcome him in the name of the governing boards to this high station, and bespeak for him perpetual confidence and support.

On the first of September last, in a haven of rest on the coast of Maine, I formally yielded to him the authority of the office; it is now my high privilege to induct him into the Presidential chair. As I do so, let me remind you of its associations. Here is the outward sign of that historic continuity by which a new foundation is united to one that is venerable.

You are thrice welcome to this seat, Ira Remsen, Doctor of Laws in Yale, Columbia, and Princeton.

May the blessing of God be with you.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

By PRESIDENT IRA REMSEN.

It has been said that "old men tell of what they have seen and heard, children of what they are doing, and fools of what they are going to do." Your speaker, fearing to furnish data that may suggest to you his place in this system of classification, prefers this morning to deal with matters that are largely independent of time.

The American University as distinguished from the College is a comparatively recent product of evolution—or of creation. Being young, its character is not fully developed, and we can only speculate in regard to its future. On an occasion of this kind, when one of the young universities of the country is celebrating in a quiet way the twenty-fifth anniversary of its foundation, and

when a new presiding officer makes his first appearance before a large assembly, it seems fitting that he, upon whom has been placed the responsibility of guiding, for the present, the affairs of the University, should take the opportunity thus afforded of giving expression to a few thoughts that suggest themselves when one begins to reflect upon the significance of the University movement in this country. Everyone at all acquainted with educational matters knows that the differentiation of the University from the College is the most characteristic fact in the history of higher education during the past quarter century. It is well that we should ask ourselves, What does this tendency mean? Whither is the movement likely to carry us?

While, from the beginning, the authorities of the Johns Hopkins University have maintained a collegiate department as well as a graduate or university department, and have endeavored to make this as efficient as possible under existing circumstances, the subjects that present themselves in connection with this branch of our work are so familiar and have been so much discussed that I can pass over them now without danger of giving the impression that we consider these subjects of less importance than those more directly connected with the work of the University. At all events, in what I shall have to say, I propose to confine myself to the latter.

The idea that a student who has completed a college course has something yet to learn, if he chooses the career of a teacher or scholar, does not appear until quite recently to have taken strong hold of the minds of those who had charge of the educational interests of our country. Perhaps it would be better to put it in this way: They do not appear to have thought it worth while to make provision in the system for those who wanted more than the college gave. The college has for its object the important work of training students for the duties of citizenship, not primarily the duties of scholarship, and no one doubts that, in the main, they have done their work well. Nor does any one doubt that, whatever may come, the college has a leading part to play in this country. Collegiate work by its very nature necessarily appeals to a much larger number than university work. But college work requires no apologist nor defender. It appeals strongly to the American people, and it is well that this is so. The college is in no danger of annihilation, though the indications are that it will undergo important modifications in the future as it has in the past. Upon this subject much might be said, and I feel strongly tempted to enlarge upon it, notwithstanding the intention already expressed of confining myself to problems more directly connected with the university proper.

There is, however, one phase of the college problem that is so closely connected with that of the university that I cannot avoid some reference to it. There is a marked and rapidly growing tendency to make college work the basis of the work in professional schools. As is well known, some of our medical schools now require a college degree for admission. The average age of graduation from our leading colleges is so high that the students cannot begin their professional courses until they are from twenty-two to twenty-three years of age on the average. Then, too, the length of the professional courses is greater than it formerly was, so that some of the best years of life are taken up in preparatory work. One thing seems to admit of no denial, and that is that, in so far as it prevents students from beginning their professional studies or their work in business life until they have attained the age of twenty-two or twenty-three, our present system is seriously defective. The defect is one that must be remedied. Various efforts are now being made looking to improvement, but it is not yet clear how the problem will be solved.

In this country the name university in the new sense is frequently applied to one department, and that is the philosophical department. This has to deal with philology, philosophy, history, economics, mathematics, physics, geology, chemistry, &c.; in short, it comprises all branches that do not form an essential part of the work of the departments of medicine, law and theology. A fully developed university, to be sure, includes at least four departments—the medical, the legal, the theological, and the philosophical; or, in other words, the university faculty comprises faculties of medicine, of law, of theology and of philosophy.

The new thing in educational work in this country is the philosophical faculty of our universities.

This meets the needs of those students who, having completed the college course, and having, therefore, had a good general training that fits them for more advanced study, wish to go forward in the paths of learning, and, so far as this may be possible, to become masters of some special branch. Most of these students are preparing to teach in colleges and elsewhere, so that the philosophical department of the university is today a professional school just as much as the medical or the legal department. On the completion of the college course, the student holds the same relation to the philosophical department of the university as to the other departments, or to the professional schools, and the age question is fully as important in the case of the student in the philosophical faculty as in the case of those who are to enter the professional schools. Now, if it be conceded, that the training of specialists—not necessarily narrow specialists, but necessarily those who are thoroughly grounded in some one subject—I say, if it be conceded that the training of specialists is essential to the growth of the highest scholar-

ship, then by advancing the age of graduation from our colleges, we are interfering with the development of scholarship in the highest sense, because the greater the age of graduation from the colleges the less will these graduates be inclined, or be able, to take up the advanced work that is essential to convert them into scholars. But let me close what I have to say on this subject by the safe prediction that the time will come when the work of our colleges will be adjusted to the work of the various faculties of the university so that the passage from the one to the other will not involve something unnatural—either hardship to the student or a telescoping of college and university which now on the whole furnishes the best way out of the existing difficulty.

I have said that the new thing in educational work in this country is the philosophical faculty of our universities. The growth of the work of the philosophical faculty has, however, undoubtedly influenced that of the other faculties—more particularly the medical. Gradually the medical schools, those connected with the universities at least, are adopting university standards. The same is true to some extent of schools of law and of theology, so that, I think, it is safe to assert that the great activity that has characterized the work of the philosophical faculties of our universities has tended in no small measure to the improvement of the work of our professional schools. It has lifted them to a higher level, and that is a result that the world at large may congratulate itself upon.

One of the most remarkable facts in connection with what we may call the development of the university idea in this country, is the surprisingly rapid increase in the attendance upon the courses offered by our philosophical faculties during the last few years. In what I shall have to say I shall for the present use the term graduate student in the restricted sense which it has come to have, meaning a college graduate who is following courses offered by the philosophical faculty of some university, and excluding, therefore, those who are studying medicine, or law, or theology in universities.

I have recently asked the United States Commissioner of Education to help me answer the following questions:

1. How many graduate students were in the United States in the year 1850?
2. How many in 1875?
3. How many in 1900?

The answers are these:

1. In 1850 there were 8 graduate students in all of the colleges of the country. Of these 3 were enrolled at Harvard, 3 at Yale, 1 at the University of Virginia and 1 at Trinity College.

2. In 1875 the number had increased to 399.

3. In 1900 the number enrolled was 5,668.

At present the number cannot be far from 6,000.

In order that these facts may be properly interpreted we should know how many Americans are studying in foreign universities. The records show that in 1835 there were 4 American students in the philosophical faculties of German universities; in 1860 there were 77; in 1880, 173; in 1891, 446; in 1892, 383; in 1895, 422, and in 1898, 397.

These figures show clearly that the increase in the attendance at American universities is not accounted for by a falling off in attendance at German universities. On the other hand, they do show that for the last ten years at least there has been no increase in the attendance at German universities, but rather a slight decrease.

Six thousand students are, then, today pursuing advanced courses in our American universities, while not longer ago than 1875 the number was only about 400. In this connection it must further be borne in mind that during this period the colleges have not relaxed in their requirements. The tendency has been in the opposite direction. So that it means today more rather than less than it did in 1875 to be a graduate student. That there is an increasing demand for university work is clear, and it seems to be destined to play a more and more important part in the development of our educational methods.

Now, what is the cause of the rapid increase in the demand for university work, or the rapid increase in the attendance upon university courses? No simple answer would be correct. Probably the principal direct cause is the increased demand on the part of the colleges, and to some extent of the high schools, for teachers who have had university training. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy being the outward and visible sign of such training, many colleges have virtually taken the ground that none but Ph. D.'s need apply. This would, of course, tend directly to increase the attendance at the universities. Operating in the same way is the multiplication of chairs in the colleges. While not long ago one man often taught a number of subjects, sometimes related, sometimes not, the college authorities are coming more and more to entrust a single subject to a single man. The old-fashioned professor who could teach any subject in the curriculum with equal success is a thing of the past except in a few remote regions. The university-trained man has largely taken his place, and the universities are spreading their influence into the nooks and corners of the country through these men.

I need not discuss this phase of the subject further. It will, I am sure, be acknowledged without argument that it is desirable that our college faculties should be made up of men who have enjoyed the best educational advantages. In supplying such men the universities are doing a work of the highest value for the country. If nothing else were accomplished by our universities they would be worthy of all the support they get. The results of their work in this direction are not as tangible as that of the work of the col-

leges, for the latter reach much larger numbers and in ways that can be more easily followed. But, if we keep in mind the fact that the college is dependent upon the university for its faculty and that the character of the college is in turn dependent upon the character of its faculty, it will be seen that whatever good may come from the college is to be traced directly to work done by the universities. In order to keep our colleges up to a high standard it is absolutely necessary that our universities should be maintained on a high plane. This university work is not something apart, independent of other kinds of educational work. It is a necessary part of the system. It affects not only our colleges, but our schools of all grades, and must, therefore, have a profound influence upon the intellectual condition of the whole country. It is difficult, perhaps, to prove this, but it seems to me that the statements just made are almost self-evident truths.

But the universities are also doing another kind of work of importance to the country. Through their specially prepared men they are doing something to enlarge the bounds of knowledge. To be sure, such work is also being done to some extent in our colleges and elsewhere, but the true home of the investigator is the university. This work of investigation is as important as the work of training men. What does it mean? All persons with healthy minds appear to agree that the world is advancing and improving. We see evidences of this on every side. Those results that appeal most strongly to most of us are, perhaps, the practical discoveries that contribute so much to the health and comfort of mankind. These are so familiar that they need not be recounted here. If great advances are being made in the field of electricity, in the field of medicine, in the field of applied chemistry, it is well to remember that the work that lies at the foundation of these advances has been done almost exclusively in the universities. It would be interesting to trace the history of some of these advances. We should find that in nearly every case the beginning can be found in some university workshop where an enthusiastic professor has spent his time prying into the secrets of nature. Rarely does the discoverer reap the tangible reward of his work—that is to say, he does not get rich—but what of it? He has his reward, and it is at least a fair question whether his reward is not higher than any that could be computed in dollars and cents.

The material value to the world of the work carried on in the university laboratories cannot be overestimated. New industries are constantly springing up on the basis of such work. A direct connection has been shown to exist between the industrial condition of a country and the attitude of the country towards university work. It is generally accepted that the principal reason why Germany occupies such a high position in certain branches of industry, especially those founded upon chemistry, is that the universities of Germany have fostered

the work of investigation more than those of any other country. That great thinker and investigator, Liebig, succeeded during the last century in impressing upon the minds of his countrymen the importance of encouraging investigations in the universities, and since that time the German laboratories of chemistry have been the leaders of the world. In Germany the chemical industries have grown to immense, almost inconceivable, proportions. Meanwhile the corresponding industries of Great Britain have steadily declined. This subject has recently been discussed by Arthur C. Green in an address read before the British Association at its meeting at Glasgow last summer. The address has been republished in "Science," volume, 2, page 7, of 1902. I call the attention especially of our business men to this address. I think it will show them that university work in some lines at least is directly and closely connected with the industrial position of a country. Speaking of the coal tar industry, the author of the paper referred to says: "In no other industry have such extraordinarily rapid changes and gigantic developments taken place in so short a period—developments in which the scientific elucidation of abstract problems has gone hand in hand with inventive capacity, manufacturing skill, and commercial enterprise; in no other industry has the close and intimate interrelation of science and practice been more clearly demonstrated." And further on: "Again, besides the loss of material wealth which the neglect of the coal-tar trade has involved to this country, there is yet another aspect of the question which is even of more importance than the commercial one. There can be no doubt that the growth in Germany of a highly scientific industry of large and far-reaching proportion has reacted with beneficial effect upon the universities, and has tended to promote scientific thought throughout the land. By its demonstration of the practical importance of purely theoretic conceptions it has had a far-reaching effect on the intellectual life of the nation. How much such a scientific revival is wanted in our country the social and economical history of the past ten years abundantly testifies. For in the struggle for existence between nations the battle is no longer to the strong in arm, but to those who are the strongest in knowledge to turn the resources of nature to the best account."

What I want to make clear by these quotations and references is that universities are not luxuries, to be enjoyed or not, as we may please. They are necessities. Their work lies at the very foundation of national well-being.

But there is another aspect of university work of greater importance than that of which I have spoken. I mean the intellectual aspect in the highest sense. The world is advancing in other ways than along material lines. While, as I have pointed out, the material interests of the world are connected with the intellectual condition, there are thoughts, there are ideas, that are above material considerations, ideas pertaining to the history of mankind, to the

origin and development of the universe, to the phenomena of life, to the development of thought, to the significance of religions. All these are of importance, and the character of a nation is determined by the extent to which these ideas are cultivated. There is call for investigation in every subject—in the various branches of philology, in history, in economics, in archæology, as well as in the natural sciences, and here again the universities furnish the workers and the workshops.

There are, then, deep-seated reasons for encouraging the work of our universities in every possible way. We cannot afford to let them languish. The interests involved are too great. The more clearly this is recognized the better for us.

The rapid advances that have been made in university work in this country have brought us somewhat suddenly face to face with new educational problems, and we have not yet had time to adjust ourselves to the new situation thus created. We are in the experimental stage. We are trying to determine how we ought to deal with our graduate students in order to get the best results; how, in general, to make the work as efficient as possible.

As one who, with others, has been engaged for twenty-five years in studying the new problems and in attempting to solve them, I may be permitted to say a few words in regard to one of the most important problems that the universities have to deal with at present. I refer to the problem of the professors. Having been a professor for about thirty years, and having during that time known intimately many of those who belong to this class and worked with them, I feel that I may speak of the professor problem with some confidence.

The university is what the professors make it, and the president has no more important duty to perform than that of seeing that the various chairs are filled by the right kind of men. He should not take the full responsibility of selection. He should take all the good advice he can get. He is sure to have some that is bad. He should, however, not only take advice, but he should endeavor to determine for himself by every available means whether or not the persons recommended to him are worthy of appointment. He should not shirk this responsibility. A mistake in this line is almost as difficult to rectify as a mistake in the matrimonial line—perhaps more difficult. It is, therefore, doubly important that an appointment should be made with great deliberation and with a full realization of the gravity of the act. It is not, however, the process of appointing that I wish especially to speak of, though much that is interesting to university circles might be said on this subject. It is rather the principles that are involved. What constitutes a good professor? What kind of men are the universities looking for? Is the supply of this kind of men equal to the demand? These are some of the questions that suggest

themselves in this connection. Let me attempt to answer them briefly.

The development of universities in this country has created a demand for a kind of professor somewhat different from that demanded by the college. It would not be difficult to describe the ideal university professor, but we should gain little in this way. I shall assume that he has the personal traits that are of such importance in those who are called upon to teach. A man of bad or questionable character, or of weak character, is no more fit to be a university professor than to be a college professor or a teacher in a school. That is self-evident. At least it seems so to me. Leaving these personal matters out of consideration, the first thing that is essential in a university professor is a thorough knowledge of the subject he teaches and of the methods of investigation applicable to that subject; the second is the ability to apply these methods to the enlargement of the field of knowledge; and the third is the ability to train others in the use of these methods. But a knowledge of the methods, the ability to apply them, and the ability to train others in their use, will not suffice. The professor, if he is to do his duty, must actually be engaged in carrying on investigations both on his own account and with the co-operation of his most advanced students. This is fundamental. It may be said, and this cannot be denied, that there is much research work done that is of little value to the world, that, in fact, much of that which is done by our graduate students is trivial judged by high standards. It would be better, no doubt, if every professor and every advanced student were engaged upon some problem of great importance to the world. But this is out of the question in any country. Few men possess that clearness of vision and that skill in devising methods, combined with the patience and power of persistent application that enable them to give the world great results. If only those who can do great things were permitted to work, the advancement of knowledge would be slow indeed. The great is built upon the little. The modest toiler prepares the way for the great discoverer. A general without his officers and men would be helpless. So would the great thinker and skillful experimenter without the patient worker, "the hewer of wood and drawer of water."

Of so-called research work there are all grades. A man may reveal his intellectual power as well as his mental defects by his investigations. But it remains true that the university professor must be carrying on research work or he is failing to do what he ought to do. It is part of his stock in trade. He cannot properly train his students without doing such work and without helping his students to do such work. One of the best results of carrying on this research work is the necessary adoption of world standards. A man may teach his classes year after year and gradually lose touch with others working in the same branch. Nothing is better calculated to keep him alive

than the carrying on of a piece of work and the publication of the results in some well-known journal. This stimulates him to his best efforts, and it subjects him to the criticism of those who know. He may deceive his students and himself—no doubt he often does—but he cannot deceive the world very long. The professor who does not show what he can do in the way of adding to the knowledge of the world, is almost sure to become provincial when he gets away from the influence of his leaders.

Other things being equal, the professor who does the best work in his special branch is the best professor. The universities want leaders. Unfortunately, the number of these is quite limited, and it is not surprising that there are not enough to go round. It is becoming very difficult to find properly qualified men to fill vacant university professorships. Given sufficient inducements and it would be quite possible to "corner the market." There are at least half a dozen, probably more, universities in this country on the lookout for young men of unusual ability. They are snapped up with an avidity that is a clear sign of the state of the market. One of the greatest obstacles in the way of the advancement of our American universities today is a lack of enough good professorial material. Fortunately, the universities are themselves providing the means by which this obstacle may be overcome, though not as rapidly as we should like. That is, however, not the fault of the universities. Some deeper cause is operating. Nature does not seem to supply enough raw material. It is often raw enough, to be sure, but its possibilities are limited.

This, too, suggests another question of deep import for the intellectual development of our country. Do our ablest men enter universities and engage in advanced work? This is a question which it is very difficult, if not quite impossible, to answer. I think it is not uncommonly assumed that they do not; that our ablest men, our best thinkers, are not in the universities. It is often said that they are in the law or in business. It may be. Certainly the great jurists and the great business men seem to be relatively more numerous than the great university teachers. I should not think it worth while to touch upon this subject were it not for the fact that recently the suggestion has been made that some of the men who become great in other lines might be induced to enter the academic career if only sufficient inducements were offered. The proposition is that a marked increase in the emoluments of professors would tend to attract some of the best material from other fields. I do not feel sure of this. In any case, the subject is hardly worth discussing. Whatever improvement is to come will come slowly, and this is fortunate. A sudden increase of the salaries of the leading professors of this country to, say, \$10,000 or more, would not suddenly change the status of these professors among their fellow men, and, while the professors might be pleased, and probably would be, the main question is,

Would this change have any effect in the desired direction? Speculation on this subject seems to me of no value. If it be true that the men of the best intellects do not find their way into university circles, it is safe to assume that this is due to a great many conditions, and that the conditions are improving. The intellectual standards of our colleges and universities are gradually being raised. We cannot force matters.

The best thing we can do for our students is to give them good professors. Sumptuous laboratories, large collections of books and apparatus, extensive museums are well enough. They are necessary, no doubt. But I fear they are too much emphasized before the public. A university is, or ought to be, a body of well-trained, intelligent, industrious, productive teachers of high character provided with the means of doing their best work for their students, and therefore for the world.

The Johns Hopkins University cannot live on its past, however praiseworthy that past may have been. If the contemplation of the past has the effect of stimulating us to our best efforts, it is a profitable occupation. If it lulls us into inactivity, it is fatal. We should not, nor can we, escape criticism for present misdeeds by referring to a glorious past. We have, to be sure, inherited certain ideals that we should cherish. So, also, we have probably done things that we ought not to have done, and the study of our past may help us to see where we have made mistakes and to show us how to avoid them in the future. There is only one way to make a university what it ought to be, and that is by doing good work according to the highest standards. Professors and students must co-operate in this. With the right professors we shall have this co-operation. Students have the power of collective judgment that is probably fairer than the judgment of any individual. They will work well if their masters work well. The professor is teaching all the time. His duty to his students is not done when he dismisses them from the lecture room or the laboratory. His influence for good or evil is continuous and lasting.

Will you allow me a few personal words? Those of you who know most of the occurrences of last year know best that the office, the duties of which I formally assume today, came to me unexpectedly and against my wishes. My life up to the present has been spent as a teacher. I ask no higher occupation. There is none more rewarding. It would have been agreeable to me to continue in this occupation to the end. Indeed, even as matters now stand, I hope it will not be necessary for me to withdraw entirely from the work to which my life has thus far been devoted. On the other hand, I recognize to the full the importance of the new work to which I have been called, and I accept the new duties with the intention of using every effort to further the interests of this university. Having taken the step, I accept the responsibility. I cannot permit anything to interfere with the work of the presidency. I

believe, however, that I shall not be obliged to give up that which is dear to me in the science of chemistry.

In conclusion, I wish to express my hearty thanks to my distinguished predecessor, to my colleagues, to the students of the University, and to this community for the kindness with which they have accepted my election. I could not ask for better treatment. In return, I can only promise to do all that in me lies to make this University worthy of its history, to make it as helpful as possible, not only to this community, of which I am proud to be a member, but to the State and to the country. It is my earnest wish, as I am sure it is yours, that the period upon which the University now enters may be at least as useful as that which now ends.

We have passed through a time of great anxiety. Causes have been in operation that have of late seriously interfered with our development. It is not strange that the world at large should have received the impression that the Johns Hopkins University has seen its best days. The fact is that the doleful stories that have been going the rounds have a slight basis. It is this: The growth of the University has been temporarily checked. It has not gone backward, but, for a time at least, it has stood still. I believe that a new day has at last dawned and that the onward march will soon be taken up. Our difficulties have by no means been overcome, but a magnificent beginning has been made. The public spirit and generosity of William Wyman, of William Keyser, of Samuel Keyser, of Francis M. Jencks, of William H. Buckler and Julian Le Roy White, are worthy of the highest commendation. These high-minded men have started the new era. They have shown their confidence in the work of the University and set an example to their fellow-men. I would not detract in the least from the praise due to every one of these gentlemen, but I am sure the others whom I have named will pardon me if in conclusion I exclaim, Long live William Wyman and William Keyser!

The pupils of Professor Gildersleeve have just published a volume entitled *STUDIES IN HONOR OF BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE*. A special copy of this volume was presented to Professor Gildersleeve at the University Club on the evening of February 20. The presentation was preceded by a dinner, at which, besides Professor Gildersleeve, there were present twenty-five persons. Professor Bloomfield presided. Addresses were made by Professor Gildersleeve, by Professor Spieker, who formally presented the volume, Professor Sihler, and others. A list of the papers in the volume is given on another page.

PRESENTATION OF CANDIDATES FOR HONORARY DEGREES.

ON BEHALF OF THE UNIVERSITY

BY

D. C. GILMAN, PRESIDENT EMERITUS.

FEBRUARY 22, 1902.

To the Assembly:

From time immemorial, it has been the custom of universities at festive celebrations, to bestow upon men of learning, personal tokens of admiration and gratitude. In conformity with this usage, our university desires to place upon its honor list the names of scholars who have been engaged with us in the promotion of literature, science and education. In accordance with the request of the Academic Council and in their name, I have the honor and the privilege of presenting to the President of the Johns Hopkins University those whose names I shall now pronounce, asking their enrolment as members of this 'Societas magistrorum et discipulorum.'

To the President:

MR. PRESIDENT; In the name of the Academic Council, I ask that several scholars, who pursued advanced studies under our guidance, without proceeding to degrees, be now admitted to the degree of Master of Arts, *honoris causâ*, and assured of our hearty welcome to this fraternity.

WILLIAM THOMAS COUNCILMAN,
BENJAMIN IVES GILMAN,
JOHN MARK GLENN,
CLAYTON COLMAN HALL,
THEODORE MARBURG,
WILLIAM L. MARBURY,
ROBERT LEE RANDOLPH,
LAWRASON RIGGS,
HENRY M. THOMAS,
JULIAN LEROY WHITE.

MR. PRESIDENT, I have now the honor of presenting to you, one by one, a number of eminent men, recommended by a committee of the professors, and of asking you to admit them to the degree of Doctor of Laws, *honoris causâ*, in the Johns Hopkins University.

Three of these scholars were friends and counsellors of the Trustees before any member of this Faculty was chosen. They pointed out the dangers to be avoided, the charts to be followed, and during seven and twenty years they have been honored friends, by whose experience we have been guided, by whose example we have been inspired.

CHARLES WILLIAM ELIOT, President of Harvard University, oldest and most comprehensive of American institutions, —the Chief, whose wisdom, vigor, and devotion to education have brought him honors which we gladly acknowledge, which we cannot augment.

JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, teacher, writer, diplomatist, scholar, excellent in every calling, whose crowning distinction is his service in developing the University of Michigan, a signal example of the alliance between a vigorous state and a vigorous university.

ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, honored Ambassador of the United States in Germany, the organizer of Cornell University, whose diplomatic success increases the distinction he had won as an able professor, a learned historian, and a liberal promoter of science, literature and art.

With these early friends, I now present to you several men who have been associated with us in carrying on the work of this University:—

JOHN SHAW BILLINGS, able adviser of the Trustees of the Johns Hopkins Hospital respecting its construction, an authority on the history of medicine, a promoter of public hygiene, a famous bibliographer and the wise administrator of public libraries in the City of New York.

GRANVILLE STANLEY HALL, who planned and directed the first laboratory of experimental psychology in the United States, and who left a professorship among us to become first President of Clark University in Worcester,—a learned and inspiring philosopher, devoted to the education of teachers in schools of every grade from the lowest to the highest.

JAMES SCHOULER, successful lecturer and writer on law and history, a lover of truth, a diligent explorer of the historical archives of this country, author of a history of the United States, comprehensive and trustworthy.

JOHN WILLIAM MALLET, of the University of Virginia, one of that brilliant band of lecturers to whom we listened in the winter of 1876–77, an ornament of the University founded by Jefferson, where scholars of every birthplace are made to feel at home; where two of our earliest colleagues had been professors. He is a chemist of international renown, whose researches are an enduring contribution to the science that he professes.

CHARLES DOOLITTLE WALCOTT, Superintendent of the United States Geological Survey, a government bureau of the highest standing, that extends its investigations to every part of the land, securing for other States, as it does for Maryland, an accurate knowledge of the structure and resources of the earth. The chief of this survey is a geologist whose administrative duties have not prevented his personal devotion to scientific research in which he maintains acknowledged eminence.

SIMON NEWCOMB, Professor of mathematics in the United States Navy, once professor here, who has carried forward the

researches initiated by Copernicus. His astronomical memoirs, above the ken of ordinary minds, have caused his name to be enrolled in the learned academies of Europe among the great investigators of celestial laws.

I have now the honor to present to you two scholars from a neighboring commonwealth, the Dominion of Canada, the representative of the University of Toronto, and the representative of McGill University in Montreal, who came to rejoice with us in this our festival,—JAMES LOUDON and WILLIAM PETERSON. We welcome them in the brotherhood of scholarship which knows of no political bounds, appreciating what they have done to uphold the highest standards of education in two great universities, with which we are closely affiliated.

It is not easy to discriminate among our own alumni, so many of whom we honor and admire, but on this occasion I have been asked to present four candidates, all of whom are widely known as scholars.

JOSIAH ROYCE, a graduate of the University of California, one of the first to be called to a fellowship among us, and one of the first four Doctors of Philosophy in this University, Doctor Subtilis, now Professor in Harvard University, Gifford lecturer in two of the Scotch universities, historian, man of letters, and philosopher.

JOHN FRANKLIN JAMESON, of the University of Chicago, one of the most accurate and serviceable students of the Constitutional History of this country, an editor of historical papers, whose rare erudition is always placed at the command of others in a spirit of generous co-operation.

EDMUND B. WILSON, of Columbia University, a profound investigator and an acknowledged authority in biological science,—one of the men not seen by the outer world, who look deeply into the fundamental laws of organic life.

WOODROW WILSON, of Princeton University, writer and speaker of grace and force, whose vision is so broad that it includes both north and south, a master of the principles which underlie a free government, whom we would gladly enrol among us a Professor of Historical and Political Science.

I now present to you nine men, the number of the muses, each of whom, like others already presented to you, is a leader of higher education,—two from New England, two from the Central States, two from the far South, one from the Northwest, and two from the Pacific coast. There are all our collaborators,—sentinels on the watch towers, heralds of the dawn.

FRANCIS LANDEY PATTON, under whose presidency 'old Nassau Hall,' the College of New Jersey, has become the University of Princeton, revered as a preacher of righteousness, admired as an Abelard in dialectics, beloved as an inspiring teacher of theology and philosophy.

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER, interpreter of the Sacred Scriptures, a fearless leader, a skillful organizer, who has brought into the front rank the University of Chicago.

CHARLES WILLIAM DABNEY, of the University of Tennessee, a man of science, and EDWARD A. ALDERMAN, of Tulane University in New Orleans, a man of letters,—two leaders in the advancement of education in the South, advocates of schools and colleges of every grade, and their zealous promoters.

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER, whose enthusiasm, energy, and knowledge of the principles and methods of Education have given him distinction throughout the land and have led to his promotion to the presidency of Columbia University in the city of New York.

HENRY SMITH PRITCHETT, astronomer and geodesist, who went from his home in Missouri to distant lands, now to observe an eclipse, now a transit, who has been the distinguished head of the United States Coast Survey, and is now the head of a vigorous foundation in Boston, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

I present to you the two representatives of learning and scholarship in 'the new world beyond the new world,' a Grecian and a student of Natural History, BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, President of the University of California,—an idealist worthy to represent the aspirations of Berkeley, and DAVID STARR JORDAN, the naturalist, who has led in the organization of the Stanford University, chiefs of two harmonious institutions, one of which was founded by private bounty, the other by the munificence of a prosperous State.

As this roll began with Harvard it ends with Yale. I present to you finally one of the strongest and most brilliant of this strong and brilliant company,—ARTHUR TWINING HADLEY, a writer and thinker of acknowledged authority on the principles of finance and administration, the honorable successor of Timothy Dwight as President of Yale University.

On Friday evening, February 21, there was a reception to the visiting delegates, alumni and friends of the University in McCoy Hall. About two thousand persons were present. On the third and fourth floors exhibits were made by the library of manuscripts, early printed books, art works, engravings and etchings. Exhibits were also made by the geological, chemical, biological, and physical departments. There were special exhibits of Oriental antiquities and books by the Semitic department, and of books and historical and archaeological relics by the historical department.

On Friday evening, February 21, there was a reception given in the Biological Laboratory by Professor Brooks and the staff of the biological department to the former students of that department.

GENERAL PROGRAMME OF THE PUBLIC EXERCISES, ETC., AT THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE UNIVERSITY.

I. FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 3 P. M., AT THE MUSIC HALL.

ORDER OF EXERCISES.

1. Music. Processional March from Tannhäuser, . . . *Wagner.*
2. Invocation by the Reverend J. HOUSTON ECCLESTON, D. D.
3. Music. Allegretto Scherzando from Symphony No. 8, . . . *Beethoven.*
4. Commemorative Address,
By DANIEL C. GILMAN, *President Emeritus.*
5. Music. Minuet from Symphony in E flat. . . . *Mozart.*
6. Presentation of an Address of the Alumni to the President
Emeritus,
By Professor WOODROW WILSON (Ph. D., 1886) of
Princeton University.
7. Short Addresses:
Principal PETERSON, of McGill University.
President HADLEY, of Yale University.
President DABNEY, of the University of Tennessee.
President HARPER, of the University of Chicago.
8. Music. Jubilee Overture, ... *Weber.*

II. RECEPTION TO VISITING DELEGATES, ALUMNI AND FRIENDS OF THE UNI- VERSITY, AND CONVERSAZIONE.

McCOY HALL, Friday, February 21, 8 p. m.

III. INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT REMSEN. SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 11 A. M., AT THE MUSIC HALL.

ORDER OF EXERCISES.

1. Music. Festival March, ... *Liszt.*
2. Address of Welcome,
By His Excellency the GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND.
3. Music. Gavottes I and II from Suite in D major, . . . *Bach.*
4. Inaugural Address, By President REMSEN.
5. Music. Finale from Symphony in D major, . . . *Haydn.*
6. Conferring of Honorary Degrees.
7. Congratulations by President ELIOT of Harvard University.
8. Music.
9. Benediction by the Reverend JOSEPH T. SMITH, D. D.

IV. RECEPTION OF THE VISITING DELEGATES AND OTHER GUESTS BY THE TRUSTEES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL.

Saturday, February 22, 2 p. m.

ALUMNI BANQUET.

V. MUSIC HALL, Saturday, February 22, at 8 p. m.

ORDER OF PROCESSION.

The order of procession at the public exercises was as follows:

I.

Chief Marshal.

President of the University and Governor of Maryland.
President Emeritus and Chaplain.
Trustees.

II.

Marshal.

Presidents of Universities and Colleges, and Official Delegates.

III.

Marshal.

National, State and City Officials. Representatives of Govern-
ment Bureaus. Specially Invited Guests. Former
Professors and Lecturers.

IV.

Marshal.

Faculty of the University.

V.

Marshal.

Alumni and Former Students.

VI.

Marshal.

Medical Students.

VII.

Marshal.

Academic Students.

Fellows.

Graduate Students.

Undergraduate Students.

The music at all the exercises was furnished by the Symphony
Orchestra under the direction of Mr. W. Edward Heimendahl, of
the Peabody Conservatory of Music.

GENERAL COMMITTEE OF ARRANGEMENTS.

The arrangements for the anniversary were in charge of the
following committee of arrangements:

J. S. AMES,
W. B. CLARK,
A. M. ELLIOTT,
B. L. GILDERSLEEVE,
E. H. GRIFFIN,

PAUL HAUPT,
WM. OSLER,
IRA REMSEN,
W. H. WELCH.

LIST OF PRESIDENTS OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES AND OFFICIAL DELEGATES TO THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY.

ARRANGED IN THE ORDER OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE INSTITUTIONS.

Harvard University:

President Charles William Eliot, LL. D.

Yale University:

President Arthur Twining Hadley, LL. D.
Professor Russell Henry Chittenden, Ph. D.

University of Pennsylvania:

Vice-Provost Edgar Fahs Smith, Ph. D., Sc. D.

Princeton University:

Reverend President Francis Landey Patton, D. D., LL. D.

Washington and Lee University:

President George H. Denny, Ph. D.
Mr. Robert Ernest Hutton.

Columbia University:

President Nicholas Murray Butler, Ph. D., LL. D.
Dean James Earl Russell, Ph. D.
Professor William Howard Carpenter, Ph. D.

Brown University:

Professor Francis Greenleaf Allinson, Ph. D.

Rutgers College:

President Austin Scott, Ph. D., LL. D.
Professor Louis Bevier, Ph. D.

Dickinson College:

Professor William Weidman Landis, Ph. B.

Franklin and Marshall College:

Reverend President John Summers Stahr, Ph. D., D. D.

St. John's College (Annapolis):

President Thomas Fell, LL. D.

Georgetown University:

Reverend President Jerome Daugherty, S. J.
Reverend Vice-President John A. Conway, S. J.
Reverend Dean Henry J. Shandelle, S. J.
Reverend Professor David Hillhouse Buck, S. J.

Williams College:

Professor Samuel Fessenden Clarke, Ph. D.

University of Tennessee:

President Charles William Dabney, Ph. D., LL. D.
Professor Charles Albert Perkins, Ph. D.

University of North Carolina:

President Francis Preston Venable, Ph. D.

Union University:

Professor Frederick Robertson Jones, Ph. D.

Middlebury College:

Professor Charles Baker Wright, A. M.

Washington and Jefferson College:

Reverend President James David Moffat, D. D., LL. D.

South Carolina College:

Professor William B. Burney, Ph. D.

University of Maryland:

The Honorable John Prentiss Poe.

Mount St. Mary's College:

Reverend President William L. O'Hara.

Central University:

Professor Chase Palmer, Ph. D.

Indiana University:

Professor James Albert Woodburn, Ph. D.

Amherst College:

Professor Arthur Lalanne Kimball, Ph. D.
Professor William Stuart Symington, Jr., Ph. D.

Columbia University:

Professor Howard Lincoln Hodgkins, Ph. D.
Professor Charles Edward Munroe, Ph. D.
Professor James Hall Lewis, D. D. S.
Professor Emil A. de Schweinitz, Ph. D., M. D.
Professor Charles Willis Needham, LL. D.

Gonzaga College:

Reverend President E. X. Fink.

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute:

President Palmer C. Ricketts.

Trinity College (Hartford):

Rev. President George Williamson Smith, D. D., LL. D.
Professor Robert Bayard Riggs, Ph. D.
Professor Charles Lincoln Edwards, Ph. D.

Kenyon College:

Professor William Peters Reeves, Ph. D.

University of Virginia:

Chairman Paul B. Barringer, M. D., LL. D.
Professor John W. Mallet, Ph. D., LL. D., F. R. S.
Professor James Morris Page, Ph. D.
Professor William M. Thornton, LL. D.

Toronto University:

President James Loudon, LL. D.
Professor Archibald Byron Macallum, Ph. D.

McGill University:

Principal William Peterson, LL. D.
Professor J. George Adami, M. D.

New York University:

Rev. Chancellor Henry Mitchell MacCracken, D. D., LL. D.
Dean Clarence Degrand Ashley, LL. D.
Professor Graham Lusk, Ph. D.
Professor Edward K. Dunham, M. D.
Professor John Dyneley Prince, Ph. D.
Professor Ernest Gottlieb Sihler, Ph. D.
Professor Christian A. Herter, M. D.

Wesleyan University:

Professor William Olin Atwater, Ph. D.
Professor Edward Bennett Rosa, Ph. D.
Professor Albert Bernhardt Faust, Ph. D.

Haverford College:

President Isaac Sharpless, LL. D.
Professor Wilfred Pirt Mustard, Ph. D.

Lafayette College:

Reverend President Ethelbert Dudley Warfield, LL. D.
Professor Edward Hart, Ph. D.

Pennsylvania College:

Professor Henry Barber Nixon, Ph. D.
Professor Charles Francis Woods, Ph. D.

Randolph-Macon College:

Professor Arthur Clarence Wightman, Ph. D.
Professor Robert Emory Blackwell.
Professor Hall Canter, Ph. D.

Delaware College:

President George Abram Harter, Ph. D.

Oberlin College:

Professor John Roaf Wightman, Ph. D.

Tulane University:

President Edwin Anderson Alderman, LL. D., D. C. L.
Professor Brown Ayres, Ph. D.

University of Michigan:

President James Burrill Angell, LL. D.

University of Missouri:

Professor George Lefevre, Ph. D.

Virginia Military Institute:

Professor Francis Mallory, C. E.

Baylor University:

Professor George Ragland, A. B.

Bucknell University:

President John Howard Harris, LL. D.

Iowa State University:

Louis Alexander Parsons, A. M.

William Jewell College:

Professor Charles Lee Smith, Ph. D.

University of Wisconsin:

Professor Richard Theodore Ely, Ph. D., LL. D.

Northwestern University:

President Edmund Janes James, Ph. D.

Loyola College:

Reverend President John F. Quirk, S. J.

Trinity College (N. C.):

Professor William Francis Gill, A. B.

Washington University:

Chancellor Winfield Scott Chaplin, LL. D.

Peabody Institute:

President Samuel C. Chew, M. D.

Maryland Agricultural College:

President R. W. Silvester.

Vassar College:

Professor John Leverett Moore, Ph. D.

Gallaudet College:

President Edward Miner Gallaudet, LL. D.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology:

President Henry Smith Pritchett, LL. D.
Professor William Thompson Sedgwick, Ph. D.
Professor Davis Rich Dewey, Ph. D.

Worcester Polytechnic Institute:

President Edmund Arthur Engler, LL. D.

University of Kansas:

Professor Frank Wilson Blackmar, Ph. D.

Lehigh University:

President Thomas Messinger Drown, LL. D.
Professor William Cleveland Thayer, A. M.

West Virginia University:

President Daniel Boardman Purinton, LL. D.

University of California:

President Benjamin Ide Wheeler, Ph. D., LL. D.
Professor Elmer Ellsworth Brown, Ph. D.
Professor Irving Stringham, Ph. D.

Cornell University:

Dean Thomas Frederick Crane, A. M.

University of Illinois:

Professor George Theophilus Kemp, Ph. D.

University of Minnesota:

Professor Henry F. Nachtrieb, S. B.

University of the South:

Vice-Chancellor Benjamin Lawton Wiggins, M. A.

Western Maryland College:

Reverend President Thomas Hamilton Lewis, A. M.

Boston University:

Reverend William S. Edwards, D. D.

Swarthmore College:

President William W. Birdsall, A. M.
Professor Edward Hicks Magill, LL. D.
Professor Jesse Herman Holmes, Ph. D.
Professor William Isaac Hull, Ph. D.

Ursinus College:

Reverend President Henry Thomas Spangler, D. D.
Professor Henry Volkmar Gummere, A. M.
Professor Karl Josef Grimm, Ph. D.
Mr. C. Ernest Dechant, A. B.

Woodstock College:

Reverend President William Pierce Brett, S. J.
Reverend Professor A. A. Maas, S. J.

University of Cincinnati:

Professor Joseph Edward Harry, Ph. D.

St. John's College (Washington):

Reverend Brother Abbas.

Wellesley College:

President Caroline Hazard, Litt. D.

Ohio State University:

Professor Henry Adam Weber, Ph. D.

Purdue University:

President Winthrop Ellsworth Stone, Ph. D.
Professor Thomas Francis Moran, Ph. D.

Smith College:

Professor Charles Downer Hazen, Ph. D.

Bryn Mawr College:

President M. Carey Thomas, Ph. D., LL. D.
Professor Charles McLean Andrews, Ph. D.

St. Joseph's Seminary:

Very Reverend J. R. Slattery.

Woman's College of Baltimore:

Reverend President John Franklin Goucher, D. D., LL. D.

Catholic University of America:

Right Reverend Thomas James Conaty, D. D., Rector.
Professor George Melville Bolling, Ph. D.
Reverend Professor John Joseph Griffin, Ph. D.

Clark University:

President Granville Stanley Hall, LL. D.

Leland Stanford Jr. University:

President David Starr Jordan, LL. D.

University of Chicago:

President William Rainey Harper, LL. D.

Drexel Institute:

President James McAlister, LL. D.

Jacob Tome Institute:

Director Abraham Winegardner Harris, LL. D.

STUDIES IN HONOR OF PROFESSOR GILDERSLEEVE.

The Johns Hopkins Press will soon issue a volume entitled *Studies in Honor of Basil L. Gildersleeve*. It will contain 527 pages together with a photogravure of Professor Gildersleeve.

On the dedicatory page will appear the following inscription:

TO
BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE
IN COMMEMORATION OF
THE SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS BIRTH
THESE STUDIES ARE DEDICATED
AS A TOKEN OF AFFECTION, GRATITUDE, AND ESTEEM
BY HIS PUPILS

θεοῦ ἐνφρων εἰη λοιπαῖς εὐχαῖς

OCTOBER 23, 1831

OCTOBER 23, 1901.

The following is the table of contents:

- The Apostolic Commission. By CHARLES A. BRIGGS.
Homeric Echoes in Matthew Arnold's "Balder Dead." By WILFRED P. MUSTARD.
Ad Catull., XXX, 4-5. By WILLIAM HAMILTON KIRK.
The Symbolic Gods. By MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.
The Use of the Simple for the Compound Verb in Persius. By HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.
The Motion of the Voice in Connection with Accent and Accentual Arsis and Thesis. By C. W. L. JOHNSON.
Augustus Princeps. By E. G. SIHLER.
The Athenian in his Relations to the State. By CHARLES ALBERT SAVAGE.
Use of the Suffixes *-anus* and *-inus* in forming Possessive Adjectives from Names of Persons. By ROBERT S. RADFORD.
The Fall of the Assyrian Empire. By CHRISTOPHER JOHNSTON.
Ne misisses, ne poposcisses, and Similar Expressions. By H. C. ELMER.
Notes on the Latin Verbs of Rating. By GORDON J. LAING.
The Pentapody in Greek Poetry. By E. H. SPIEKER.
Horace and Lucilius: A Study of Horace Serm. I, 10. By GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON.
The Aim and Results of Plato's Theaetetus. By W. J. ALEXANDER.
On the Uses of the Prepositions in Homer. By A. S. HAGGETT.
An Erroneous Phonetic Sequence. By EDWIN W. FAY.
The Connection between Music and Poetry in Early Greek Literature. By H. RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH.
Some Statistics on the Order of Words in Greek. By HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.
The Athens of Aristophanes. By MITCHELL CARROLL.
On the Theory of the Ideal Condition in Latin. By GONZALEZ LODGE.
On the Case Construction of Verbs of Sight and Hearing in Greek. By JAMES WILLIAM KERN.
The Scenic Value of the Miniatures in the Manuscripts of Terence. By JOHN W. BASORE.
Pupula Duplex. By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.
Ingenium in the Ablative of Quality and the Genitive of Quality. By GEORGE VAIL EDWARDS.
Magic in Theokritos and Vergil. By MORRIS C. SUTPHEN.
The Interpretation of Euripides' Alceste. By AUGUSTUS TABER MURRAY.
Chiasmus in the Epistles of Cicero, Seneca, Pliny and Fronto. By R. B. STEELE.

On Causes Contributory to the Loss of the Optative, etc., in Later Greek.

By FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

The Etymology and Meaning of the Sanskrit Root *id*. By JENS A. NESS.

The Technic of Shakspeare's Sonnets. By THOMAS R. PRICE.

The Attitude of Alcuin toward Vergil. By OMER A. FLOYD LONG.

Notes on Lucian's Syrian Goddess. By DANIEL A. PENICK.

The Greeting in the Letters of Cicero. By E. M. PEASE.

Oration XI of Dio Chrysostomus. A Study in Sources.

By WALTER A. MONTGOMERY.

The Use of *aque* and *ac* in Silver Latin. By EMORY B. LEASE.

Indicative Questions with *μή* and *ἄρα μή*. By J. E. HARRY.

Rime-Parallelism in Old High German Verse. By BERT JOHN VOS.

Did Euripides write *σκόμναν* Hipp. 1276? By HENRY N. SANDERS.

The Participle in Apollonius Rhodius. By GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

Μή for *οὐ* before Lucian. By EDWIN L. GREEN.

A Tragic Fragment of Ion. By JOHN ADAMS SCOTT.

The Metaphor in Aeschylus. By J. T. LEES.

The Relation of the Rhythm of Poetry to that of the Spoken Language with especial reference to Ancient Greek. By C. W. E. MILLER.

Index.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS OF BALTIMORE.

- I. American Journal of Mathematics. FRANK MORLEY, Editor. Quarterly. 4to. Volume XXIV in progress. \$5 per volume.
- II. American Chemical Journal. IRA REMSEN, Editor. Monthly. 8vo. Volume XXVII in progress. \$5 per year.
- III. American Journal of Philology. B. L. GILDERSLEEVE, Editor. Quarterly. 8vo. Volume XXIII in progress. \$3 per volume.
- IV. Studies from the Biological Laboratory. 8vo. Volume V complete.
- V. Studies in History and Politics. Monthly. 8vo. Volume XX in progress. \$3 per volume.
- VI. Johns Hopkins University Circulars. Monthly. 4to. Volume XXI in progress. \$1 per year.
- VII. Johns Hopkins Hospital Bulletin. Monthly. 4to. Volume XIII in progress. \$1 per year.
- VIII. Johns Hopkins Hospital Reports. 4to. Volume X in progress. \$5 per volume.
- IX. Contributions to Assyriology, etc. Volume IV in progress.
- X. Memoirs from the Biological Laboratory. W. K. BROOKS, Editor. Volume V in progress.
- XI. Modern Language Notes. A. M. ELLIOTT, Editor. Monthly. 4to. Volume XVII in progress. \$1.50 per volume.
- XII. The Journal of Experimental Medicine. W. H. WELCH, Editor. Bi-monthly. 4to. Volume VI in progress. \$5 per volume.
- XIII. American Journal of Insanity. HENRY M. HURD, Editor. Quarterly. 4to. \$5 per volume.
- XIV. Reports of the Maryland Geological Survey.
- XV. Terrestrial Magnetism and Atmospheric Electricity. L. A. BAUER, Editor. Quarterly. 8vo. Volume VII in progress. \$2.50 per volume.
- XVI. Annual Report of the Johns Hopkins University. Presented by the President to the Board of Trustees.
- XVII. Annual Register of the Johns Hopkins University. Giving the list of officers and students, and stating the regulations, etc.

A NEW CRITICAL EDITION OF THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Edited by Paul Haupt. Prospectus on application.

ROWLAND'S PHOTOGRAPH OF THE NORMAL SOLAR SPECTRUM. 10 plates. \$20.

THE DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES AND SPANISH AMERICA. By John H. Latané (The Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History for 1899). 294 pp. 12mo. \$1.50.

THE DIPLOMATIC HISTORY OF THE SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY. By J. M. Callahan. (The Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History for 1900). 304 pp. 12mo. \$1.50.

SELECTIONS FROM THE EARLY SCOTTISH POETS. By Wm. Hand Browne. 240 pp. 16mo. \$1.25.

Communications should be addressed to The Johns Hopkins Press.

The Johns Hopkins University Circulars are issued monthly. They are printed by JOHN MURPHY COMPANY, No. 44 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore. Subscriptions \$1.00 a year, may be addressed to THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, BALTIMORE; single copies will be sent by mail for ten cents each.